

83D CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{ DOCUMENT
No. 29 }

PERSONNEL INVESTIGATIONS OF
EMPLOYEES AND APPLICANTS FOR
EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE
BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR
LOYALTY, SUITABILITY, AND SECURITY

A REPORT WITH CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS MADE AS A RESULT OF THE INVESTIGATION INTO THE PERSONNEL NEEDS AND PRACTICES OF THE VARIOUS GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES BEING CONDUCTED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICIES PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 53, AS AMENDED BY SENATE RESOLUTIONS 206 AND 288, WITH THE PURPOSE OF FORMULATING POLICIES FOR THE MOST EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL DURING THE PERIOD OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY



PRESENTED BY MR. JOHNSTON
March 18, 1953

MARCH 20, 1953.—Ordered to be printed

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1953

26011

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

FRANK CARLSON, Kansas, *Chairman*

JAMES H. DUFF, Pennsylvania

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Kentucky

DWIGHT GRISWOLD, Nebraska

WILLIAM A. PURTELL, Connecticut

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina

MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia

JOHN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island

MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma

PRICE DANIEL, Texas

FRANK A. PASCHAL, *Chief Clerk*

II

PERSONNEL INVESTIGATIONS OF EMPLOYEES AND APPLICANTS FOR EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR LOYALTY, SUITABILITY, AND SECURITY

In its study of manpower policies as followed by the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, the subcommittee has given a considerable amount of thought to the problems arising from the various types of personnel investigations which enter into the hiring and firing of Government employees. These fall into three major categories; viz, loyalty, security, and suitability checks, which are made either prior to or subsequent to employment, and all of which require investigations of varying degrees. While the nature, extent, and thoroughness of the investigation is largely dependent upon the type of work to be done by the employee, as well as the nature of the employing agency, all investigations seek to determine something of the past history and activities of the principal, in order that the employer may determine his fitness for the job, aside from and in addition to his professional qualifications as evidenced by his application for employment.

Confusion exists in the area of personnel investigations by reason of the fact that there are three general programs dealing with the denial of employment, and the suspension and separation of Government employees. The Interdepartmental Committee on Internal Security, in a report dated April 29, 1952, points out that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to draw clear lines of demarcation among the suitability, security, and loyalty programs. This fact often results in multiple investigations of the same individual by numerous Government agencies. For example, it is not unusual for the Civil Service Commission to conduct a loyalty check, the Civil Service Commission and/or an agency to conduct some type of suitability check, and for the agency to conduct a security investigation. Since there is no clear line of demarcation among these program areas, the same ground is frequently covered more than once.

The Civil Service Commission has been designated by law (Public Law 298, 82d Cong.) as the agency which will conduct loyalty checks for all agencies, as well as background investigations for the Atomic Energy Commission, Mutual Security Agency, and the State Department. In addition, the Commission's services are available to other agencies for such background investigations and national agencies' checks as are desired. All these services are performed on a reimbursable basis. It was found, however, that not all agencies avail themselves of the investigative facilities of the Civil Service Commission, but instead maintain staffs of investigators, part of whose duties, at least, parallel those of the Commission, with a consequent duplication of effort, and a resulting waste of manpower and money.

In order to obtain detailed information on the divergent investigative procedures followed in Government, the following letter was sent on July 8, 1952, to some 48 agencies in the metropolitan area:

This subcommittee is conducting a survey of Federal personnel and manpower practices with the aim of recommending legislative or other appropriate changes where advisable. As part of this survey, we are reviewing the practices followed in making administrative checks and investigations of applicants and employees. We are limiting our interests to the areas of suitability, loyalty, and security checks and investigations.

To better aid us in accomplishing our stated legislative purposes, it is necessary that we obtain some preliminary information from you as follows:

- (1) Do you have an investigative staff engaged in making suitability, loyalty, or security checks or investigations of applicants and employees of your agency?
- (2) Does your agency conduct suitability, loyalty, or security checks or investigations for other Federal agencies? List these agencies.
- (3) Under what legal or administrative authority does the investigative staff operate?
- (4) Do any other agencies conduct part or all of your suitability, loyalty, or security checks or investigations? List these agencies and indicate the extent of assistance to you.
- (5) Under what legislative or administrative authority is such assistance given? A prompt reply to this inquiry will be greatly appreciated.

From the replies received, it was apparent that 15 agencies maintain complete investigative staffs, while the remaining 35 agencies depended upon the Civil Service Commission for making such personnel investigations as were required. It will be noted, however, that the 15 agencies referred to, while less than 30 percent of the total number queried, actually employ over 85 percent of personnel employed by the executive department.

Of the 15 agencies with investigative staffs, only the Civil Service Commission, the FBI, and the State Department do any considerable number of investigations for other agencies. The Department of State aids various agencies when information is required from foreign countries. The Army Department conducts certain investigations abroad for other agencies. The General Services Administration conducts security investigations for the Defense Materials Procurement Agency. Some of the Treasury Department bureaus with investigation staffs make certain investigations for other bureaus in that Department. It might be well to add here that outside of the Civil Service Commission and the Department of State, personnel investigations make up only a small part of these 15 agencies' investigation workload.

A variety of statutes confer authority for investigative staffs. Even without specific authority, however, it appears that most agencies could conduct security investigations under the authority of the agency head to prescribe regulations for the government of the agency and for the conduct of its officers and employees.

Following receipt of this initial information, a questionnaire was dispatched to the 15 agencies which maintained their own investigative staffs.

For the sake of brevity and clarity, the replies to this questionnaire have been summarized and tabulated in a manner to show the diversity of operations among the several agencies. These tabulations follow:

ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. *Are checks and/or investigations performed by your agency in Washington, or the field, or both?*

Agriculture: Both.

Air Force: Both.

Army: Primarily by headquarters of Army commands.

Civil Service Commission: Both.

Commerce: Primarily by central office. Field service utilized but not on full-time basis.

General Services Administration: Both.

Justice Department: Primarily by field offices. Supervised by central FBI office.

Navy Department: Both.

Post Office Department: Both.

State Department: Both.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue (character investigations by field not agency at Washington).

Secret Service: Both.

Customs: Field only.

Narcotics: Both.

Coast Guard: Both.

2. *Is a central file or index kept of this work? If so, in what manner?*

Agriculture: No.

Air Force: Central index in Fourth O. S. I. district office in Washington. Reports filed in various field offices.

Army: Continental United States investigative results at G-2 Central Records, Fort Holabird, Md. Overseas at major command headquarters. Eventually copies of all to be in Maryland.

Civil Service Commission: Master index file.

Commerce: Central file in Washington.

General Services Administration: Central file in Washington.

Justice Department: Central index in Washington. Reports in Washington. Records are in the field, I believe.

Navy Department: Yes. Contains results of both field and Washington investigations.

Post Office: Yes. Indexed with copies of jackets of cases maintained by Chief Post Office Inspector.

State Department: Yes. Index a file of all previous personnel investigations by State and other agencies and sources.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: Yes; central file and index.

Secret Service: Yes; central file and index.

Customs: No file maintained.

Narcotics: Yes; investigative reports.

Coast Guard: Yes; central file and index.

3. To what extent do you limit the investigative authority of your field offices?

(a) Can they initiate, extend coverage, or close an investigation?

(b) If so; how does headquarters record this work data?

Agriculture: (a) Field offices have complete authority. (b) Does not record. Field offices or central bureaus would have the information.

Air Force: (a) Field offices do not initiate or extend. (b) Records of investigative activity in field furnished central office by a monthly report.

Army: (a) Major commands have complete authority. (b) Only completed report filed in central office.

Civil Service Commission: (a) Investigations scheduled from central office. Field may extend coverage. Field initiates certain types within framework of CSC policy. Field may close when minimum standards of Commission are met. (b) As each case initiated or closed, information recorded in master index. Applies to field or central office.

Commerce: (a) Field office may not initiate, extend, or close.

General Services: (a) May initiate, but not extend, nor close. Allows headquarters to conduct agency check.

Justice Department: (a) For applicants for FBI, field can initiate. On all others, may not; may extend coverage if deemed necessary. May close, but reviewed in Washington. Reports filed in District of Columbia.

Navy: Limited to matters within jurisdiction of Office of Naval Intelligence and those of official interest. (a) Yes. (b) Activity reports furnished ONI by each naval district.

Post Office: (a) Yes; only as to applicants or employees of Bureau Chief Inspector. (b) Case records and index.

State: (a) Initiated by Washington. Field office may extend coverage or broaden scope of investigation. If derogatory information is uncovered, field office may submit preliminary report and suspend further investigation pending instructions from Washington. (b) Field offices are credited with number of investigations completed.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: (a) May initiate character investigations, but do not close case. Sent to Washington for review. (b) Card index of all Washington and field investigations.

Secret Service: (a) All initiated in Washington and finally reviewed by Washington. (b) Continuing records maintained by control cards.

Customs: (a) No limitation on field office may initiate, extend coverage, and close cases. (b) Copies of investigation reports forwarded by each agent with his monthly work report.

Narcotics: (a) No. (b) Reports are submitted to Washington where index and files are maintained.

Coast Guard: (a) Yes. (b) Copies of all investigations sent to Washington for review and filing.

4. *Are any results of your work furnished the Civil Service Commission or any other agency?*

Agriculture: Results of preemployment inquiries of all persons appointed are furnished Civil Service Commission with the required loyalty form.

Air Force: Through established liaison with agencies concerned. Removals for cause furnished CSC.

Army: Results furnished on a "need-to-know" basis to CSC and other agencies.

Civil Service Commission: Information in master index made available to other agencies.

Commerce: CSC notified of the completion of an investigation through form 79. Reports available upon specific request.

General Services: Yes.

Justice: Form 79 sent CSC on FBI applicants; results of investigation not furnished unless requested. Results of applicants for other agencies forwarded to requesting agency, CSC furnished all reports reflecting on loyalty if in executive branch, also on sex perversion. Security information also furnished other interested intelligence agencies.

Navy: Yes; to Civil Service and other agencies affected, through liaison representatives.

Post Office: No.

State: To Civil Service by means of form 79 and form 57 if appointed.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: To Civil Service, form 79. Only favorable reports sent to Civil Service except in cases already certified by CSC.

Secret Service: To Civil Service form 79 copy of report sent when applicant employed.

Customs: Loyalty matters only referred to Civil Service.

Narcotics: Copies of reports sent to CSC regional office.

Coast Guard: Form 79 sent to CSC. Reports only in questionable loyalty cases.

5. *Do you make a national agency check of any kind prior to initiating an investigation? If so, where and how is it made?*

Agriculture: No; in preappointment inquiries made by agencies of the Department.

Air Force: The Air Force does not conduct a national agency check on civilian employees checked under part I, Executive Order 9835.

Army: Apparently only as a part of a complete background investigation.

Civil Service Commission: Preappointment national agency checks when requested by agencies for security purposes.

Commerce: National agency checks made prior to all security investigations unless personnel file shows Civil Service Commission or other agency has already made. Such national agency checks are usually made through telephone liaison with other agencies.

General Services: Yes. Checks CSC first; other sources also checked (FBI, Naval Intelligence, etc.) by correspondence or personal contact.

Justice: CSC files checked simultaneously with initiation of investigation. Also other major sources of information.

Navy: Only if no information on file as disclosed by form 79.

Post Office: Not generally. Temporary Christmas help checked with police departments of some large cities.

State: In case of sensitive position checks only.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: No.

Secret Service: No.

Customs: No.

Narcotics: Yes.

Coast Guard: Yes.

6. *How do you obtain and what use do you make of a previous investigation by another Government agency? Describe in detail.*

Agriculture: When it is learned that an investigative file is in another department, material used. If sufficient, no further investigation made.

Air Force: Through liaison with other investigative agencies. If prior investigations meet Defense Department standards, prior investigations accepted. If not, supplemented.

Army: Actually, about the same as Air Force.

Civil Service Commission: Checks master index. If shown that a previous report available, that report is used, and/or supplemented.

Commerce: If inquiry reveals existence of investigative file, file reviewed and accepted at face value. If necessary, brought up to date. Civil Service Commission is sometimes requested to conduct full background investigations on suitability for access to top-secret information.

General Services: Agents review prior investigations; summary becomes a part of GSA report. No duplication on leads, but are brought up to date.

Justice: Agency file reviewed. "Information fully utilized in conjunction with FBI investigation."

Navy: Previous investigations reviewed. If current, referred to requesting naval installations for evaluation and determination of need for additional investigations.

Post Office: Do not make use of previous investigation.

State: Obtain through form 79. If adequate, further investigation is canceled.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: Obtained through form 79 and reviewed by field office.

Secret Service: Same as above.

Customs: Obtained from Civil Service and current investigation covers period from date of last investigation.

Narcotics: Obtains copy of report, if possible, otherwise calls on agency and extracts information from report.

7. *Does any other agency assist you in the conduct of an investigation? If so, to what extent?*

Agriculture: No.

Air Force: Furnish information in files.

Army: Through national agency checks, and informal cooperation.

Civil Service Commission: Other agencies make files available.

Commerce: Not directly.
 General Services: Not directly.
 Justice: Not directly.
 Navy: Occasionally.
 Post Office: No.
 State: Yes; Post Office, Secret Service, and FBI, and others by mutual arrangement, in territorial possessions.

Treasury:
 Internal Revenue: No.
 United States Secret Service: No.
 Customs: No.
 Narcotics: No.
 Coast Guard: Yes; name check.

8. *Could the Civil Service Commission or any other agency assist you and in what respect?*

Agriculture: No.
 Air Force: No further assistance.
 Army: No further assistance.
 Civil Service Commission: No further assistance.
 Commerce: No further assistance.
 General Services Administration: No further assistance.
 Justice: No further assistance.
 Navy: Civil Service Commission now assists through master index.
 Post Office: No.
 State: No more than at present.
 Treasury:
 Internal Revenue: Civil Service Commission, through master index. Other agencies by furnishing reports.
 Secret Service: Not necessary.
 Customs; Civil Service Commission master index.
 Narcotics: No.
 Coast Guard: Civil Service Commission master index.

9. *Do you have any cost records of a check or investigation? If so, please furnish.*

Agriculture: No.
 Air Force: No records are maintained of the individual cost of a security check or investigation of civilians.
 Army: Cost records maintained by the Army do not reflect the cost of individual checks or investigations.
 Civil Service Commission: Cost shown in question 29.
 Commerce: Cost records of individual investigations not maintained.
 General Services: No individual cost record by case. Overall records indicate average cost \$160 per case.
 Justice: Cost by different types of applicant investigations:

Agency	Salaries	Other cost, travel included	Total unit cost
Atomic Energy Commission.....	\$123.21	\$26.47	\$149.68
Mutual Security Agency.....	153.35	33.14	186.49
Technical Cooperation Administration.....	195.31	26.44	221.75
Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	145.44	31.76	177.20

8 PERSONNEL INVESTIGATIONS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Navy: No.
Post Office: No.
State: Yes. Average cost, \$110.50, including pro rata of management, etc. Furniture and rentals not included.
Treasury:
Internal Revenue: Not available.
Secret Service: Not maintained.
Customs: Not maintained.
Narcotics: Not maintained.
Coast Guard: Not maintained.

10. *Have you developed or furnished standards for various types of investigations? If so, please furnish.*

Agriculture: Some standards furnished.
Air Force: Established by Secretary of Defense.
Army: Standards based on Defense Department minimum standards. (Copy furnished.)
Civil Service: Established. (Copy furnished.)
Commerce: Informal standards developed.
General Services: Standards furnished.
Justice: Type material investigated mentioned in answer.
Navy: Background investigations conform to standards established by D. O. D., June 14, 1950.
Post Office: No published standards.
State: Standards appear in manual.
Treasury:
Internal Revenue: Published standards.
Secret Service: Published standards.
Customs: Published standards.
Narcotics: Not indicated.
Coast Guard: Same as Navy.

11. *Is a check or an investigation conducted before or after final selection of an applicant?*

Agriculture: Before.
Air Force: Before (wording somewhat vague).
Army: Normally before. Exceptional cases otherwise.
Civil Service Commission: Records checks and inquiries usually after. However, preappointment national agency checks for sensitive positions, postmaster candidates, and most competitive qualifications investigations before.
Commerce: Assignment to sensitive jobs delayed until check made, although individual may be hired. Messengers are prechecked.
General Services: Limited investigations and/or agency checks for sensitive positions.
Justice: Before for FBI men. Varies with other agencies. (Justice has not given us its position.)
Navy: Both, depending upon sensitivity of position.
Post Office: Before.
State: Before.
Treasury:
Internal Revenue: Both.
Secret Service: Before.
Customs: Before.

Narcotics: Before.

Coast Guard: Only sensitive position incumbents investigated.
Preappointment.

12. *What is the average time that has elapsed during the past 6 months between the time when an applicant investigation is authorized until the investigative report is cleared to the personnel office?*

Agriculture: No information available with respect to preappointment suitability inquiries made by agencies of the Department.

Air Force: Approximately 1 month.

Army: National agency check, 1-3 months; background investigation, 6-9 months.

Civil Service Commission: Preappointment national agency checks in clear cases, 10 days; full record check under Executive Order 9835, 11 weeks; other exceptions.

Commerce: Depends upon how long it takes CSC to process under Executive Order 9835; varies from 1 to 12 months.

General Services: 13 calendar days.

Justice: FBI positions, average 31.1 calendar days; only statistics on AEC, 47.7 days.

Navy: Approximately 6 months.

Post Office: 30 to 70 calendar days.

State: 55.6 days. Priority 1, specific date due. Priority 2, 45 days. Priority 3, 90 days.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: 60 days.

Secret Service: 60 days.

Customs: 39 days average.

Narcotics: About 3 weeks.

Coast Guard: Not agency check, 3 to 6 weeks; background investigation, 3 to 6 months.

13. *Does your policy and program of checks and investigations vary with the types of personnel, or with the volume of personnel? If so, explain*

Agriculture: Somewhat, depending upon the type of position for which applicant is being considered.

Air Force: Dependent on degree of access to security information involved, whether the individual is a United States citizen, whether he is subject to investigations prescribed by Executive Order 9835.

Army: Does not vary. Must meet standards in S. R. 380-160-1. Only two types: a national agency check and a background investigation.

Civil Service Commission: Does not vary except for competitive qualifications cases, and investigations of its own employees.

Commerce: Does not vary except dependent upon degree of security involved.

General Services: Extent of investigation depends upon degree of sensitivity of position. The volume or classification does not determine extent of investigation.

Justice: For FBI, no. For other agencies the scope of investigation dependent upon law or directive under which conducted.

Navy: No.

Post Office: Some variation. Investigation for inspector jobs receives rigorous investigations.

State: Some variation, especially for overseas jobs, when spouse or overseas relatives are concerned.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: Varies as prescribed in manual.

Secret Service: Varies according to degree of sensitivity.

Customs: No variation.

Narcotics: No variation.

Coast Guard: No variation.

14. *Do you get any assistance from any other agency or Civil Service Commission in developing investigative programs?*

Agriculture: No.

Air Force: No.

Army: Only as answered in previous questions (no).

Civil Service Commission: Originally from FBI.

Commerce: No.

General Services: Only informal basis.

Justice: No.

Navy: No.

Post Office: No.

State: No.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: No.

Secret Service: No.

Customs: Yes; from technical adviser to Secretary and from CSC.

Narcotics: No.

Coast Guard: No.

15. *If not, have you asked for assistance?*

Agriculture: No.

Air Force: No.

Army: No.

Civil Service: Not applicable.

Commerce: No.

General Services: No.

Justice: No.

Navy: No.

Post Office: No.

State: No.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: No.

Secret Service: No.

Customs: No.

Narcotics: No.

Coast Guard: No.

16. *Would you prefer to have the Civil Service Commission or another Government agency do all your administrative checks and investigations? If not, give your reasons.*

Agriculture: No. Believe persons closest to job better able to solicit and evaluate more promptly and effectively the information.

Air Force: No. Ultimate responsibility for safeguarding security information rests with Secretary of Air Force. Prefer to investigate our employees for clearance.

Army: Same as Air Force. Accepts Civil Service Commission investigations of lower category of classified recruiting information.

Civil Service: Not applicable.

Commerce: No. Can do it more economically, faster, controlled better. Head of department responsible for security; should have his own staff.

General Services: No. Flexibility is required in scheduling investigative program. Best done by organization familiar with operations.

Justice: Not for FBI because of confidential nature of work. Justice to provide separate answer.

Navy: No.

Post Office: No.

State: No.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: No.

Secret Service: No.

Customs: No.

Narcotics: No.

Coast Guard: No.

17. *What are your suggestions for improving your present investigative setup?*

Agriculture: None, except additional funds.

Air Force: None.

Army: None.

Civil Service Commission: None.

Commerce: None.

General Services: None.

Justice: None.

Navy: None.

Post Office: None.

State: Increase in staff.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: Continuous study under way for improvement.

Secret Service: Continuous study under way for improvement.

Customs: More personnel.

Narcotics: Present setup satisfactory.

Coast Guard: Present setup satisfactory.

18. *What, in your opinion, is needed to reduce areas of possible duplication in the investigation of personnel?*

Agriculture: Not aware of any. If all agencies report to CSC initiation of background investigations and make use of master index, will not be serious factor.

Air Force: Duplication slight. Maintenance of appropriate notations in personnel folder and close liaison with other investigative agencies will minimize possible duplication.

Army: Any area of improvement lies in integrating information of administrative checks and investigations. Current procedures for conducting national agency checks tend to reduce this area of possible duplication.

Civil Service: We sometimes find that individual installations of agencies start a practice of making checks, usually by voucher, of persons after appointment. These limited checks are not reported to our master index file. Often this check duplicates ones under loyalty program. This could be prevented if agencies avoided checks of the type made by Commission under loyalty program until arrangements had been worked out with Commission to insure that there would be no duplication.

Commerce: No duplication.

General Services: Continued cooperation between various investigative agencies. Central file in CSC and use of form 79 more materially reduced areas of duplication.

Justice: Laws controlling certain investigations require FBI to make an investigation whether or not the person has been previously investigated.

Navy: Duplication negligible.

Post Office: Sees no duplication.

State: Full cooperation with Civil Service Commission by all agencies. Current maintenance of master index.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: No material duplication.

Secret Service: No suggestions.

Customs: No duplication.

Narcotics: No duplication.

Coast Guard: Uniform security clearance including reciprocity of clearance.

19. *What has been the number of qualified personnel investigated by your agency and approved for employment since July 1950, but who were not available for employment?*

Agriculture: No data available.

Air Force: No central point to obtain information.

Army: Not applicable to investigations conducted.

Civil Service Commission: No records on this.

Commerce: Not applicable.

General Services: Information not available.

Justice: From June 30, 1951, to present (October 1952) 1,493 offered appointments who did not accept. In this period 5,599 employees entered on duty. No figures on other agencies—for remainder in Justice, reply awaited.

Navy: No record.

Post Office: No record.

State: Information being compiled.

Treasury: All agencies, 126 (does not include Internal Revenue).

20. *What percentage of the failures to appear was caused in whole or in part by the delays of the investigation?*

Agriculture: Not known.
Air Force: Statistics not available.
Army: Not applicable.
Civil Service: No records.
Commerce: No records.
General Services: No records.
Justice: For FBI, no records. Justice to report.
Navy: No information.
Post Office: No information.
State: Will submit later.
Treasury: All agencies, negligible.

21. (a) *What was the total number of checks and investigations made by your agency during the period of January 1 to July 1, 1952?*

(b) *Of the total of (a) above, how many were prior United States Government employees?*

(c) *Of the total of (a) above, how many had been previously investigated?*

Agriculture: (a) Thirty-nine agency checks for clearance classified confidential; 240 full background investigations, 227 of these for classified secret or top secret; 13 suitability—key positions. (b) All involved employees of the Department. (c) Data not readily available.

Air Force: (a) 8,538. (b) No central records. (c) No central records.

Army: Information not readily separated.

Civil Service Commission: (a) Background investigations, 1,363; record checks and inquiries, 426,501; suitability conversions, 19,083; veterans preference cases, 630; other merit system cases, 1,163; postmaster candidates, 1,378; competitive qualifications, 157; total 450,275. (b) On a spot check basis of 1,000, 370 previously employed. Of this 73 had had record checks, and 33 personal investigations.

Commerce: (a) 125 background investigations, 2,700 national agency checks (estimate). (b) These employees already in Department. (c) No statistics.

General Services: (a) 860. (b) Unknown. (c) Approximately 10 percent.

Justice: (a) In FBI, 7,224. July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, 3,092 for Justice, 97,874 other agencies. (b) Figures not available. From June 1 to August 25, 1952, 53 came with FBI who had previous Federal service. (c) No records.

Navy: (a) No statistics. (b) No statistics. (c) No statistics.

Post Office: (a) 5,264. (b) No statistics. (c) No statistics.

Treasury: (a) 1,116. (b) 368. (c) 269.

22. *What was the total number of checks and investigations for period of January 1 to July 1, 1950?*

Agriculture: 26 agency checks; 62 full background by central office.

Air Force: 4,894.

Army: Data not readily available.

Civil Service: Record checks and inquiries, 105,015; suitability conversions, 2,754; veterans preference cases, 667; other merit system cases, 1,313; postmaster candidates, 833; competitive qualifications, 1,236; character and fitness, 82; total, 111,900.

Commerce: No statistics.

General Services: No statistics.

Justice: For FBI, 2,895. Approximate figure for Justice, 1,235; other agencies, 23,928.

Navy: No statistics.

Post Office: No statistics.

State: 4,093.

Treasury: 2,596.

23. *What is the total number of appointments for which investigations by your agency were necessary during January 1 to July 1, 1952?*

Agriculture: Information not readily available.

Air Force: No figures available.

Army: Not readily available.

Civil Service: Approximately 288,209 record checks.

Commerce: No statistics.

General Services: 629 preappointment clearances granted.

Justice: In FBI, 2,253. Not available for other agencies. Justice to reply.

Navy: No statistics.

Post Office: No statistics.

State: No statistics; supplemental report will be furnished.

Treasury: 702.

24. *What was the total number in the above answer handled by headquarters and in the field?*

Agriculture: Information not available.

Air Force: Information not available.

Army: Information not available.

Civil Service: Information not available.

Commerce: Information not available.

General Services: Approximately one-third headquarters, two-thirds field.

Justice: FBI, all investigations supervised by headquarters but done in field. For other agencies, information not available. Justice to reply.

Navy: No statistics.

Post Office: No statistics.

State: All originate in Washington but are handled by field.

Treasury: Washington, 188; field, 516.

25. *What was the number of persons rejected because of information obtained as a result of your check or investigation?*

Agriculture: No information.

Air Force: No information.

Army: No information.

PERSONNEL INVESTIGATIONS: IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH 10

Civil Service: Number of persons rated ineligible:

Fiscal year 1951:	
Suitability conversions	1, 817
Veterans preference cases	110
Other merit cases	560
Character and fitness	76
Total	2, 563
Fiscal year 1952:	
Suitability conversions	4, 380
Veterans preference cases	160
Other merit cases	654
Background cases (CSC personnel)	324
Total	5, 518

Commerce: No information.

General Services: January 1-July 1, 1952, 91 denied preappointment clearances.

Justice: FBI, 4,971 rejected January 1-July 1, 1952. No information on other agencies. Justice to reply.

Navy: No information.

Post Office: No statistics.

State: Will furnish supplemental report.

Treasury: 70.

26. *What qualifications are your investigators required to possess?*

Agriculture: Prior investigative experience, law or accounting background.

Air Force: High academic qualifications, unimpeachable character and integrity, professional background adaptable to the general field of investigation.

Army: Selection criteria attached.

Civil Service: Experience, or 4-year education above high school level, combination of these two, or membership in State bar.

Commerce: College education, experience, meet CSC requirements.

General Services: Classified in general investigating series, must meet Civil Service requirements.

Justice: FBI, law degree; graduate of accounting school, with 3 years' experience in accounting and/or auditing; physical standards.

Navy: High academic and personal qualifications.

Post Office: Medical and political.

State: Must meet CSC qualifications.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: (a) Must know all rules; (b) ability to talk with others; (c) ability to weigh and state facts; (d) ability to organize investigations; (e) ability to plan work and supervise; (f) ability to make decisions.

Secret Service: CSC standards.

Customs: CSC standards.

Narcotics: Must be qualified narcotics agents.

Coast Guard: Petty officer, screened for qualifications.

27. What special training are they given?

Agriculture: On-the-job training.
Air Force: Basic training course. Some are given specialized training.
Army: 14-week basic training. Some are given specialized training.
Civil Service: 2 weeks basic training course; on-the-job training, 3 months; then special training.
Commerce: No special training.
General Services: On-the-job training.
Justice: FBI, 16 weeks training course. Constant review afterward.
Navy: Thorough indoctrination.
Post Office: On-the-job training.
State: (a) Indoctrination; (b) duty in headquarters; (c) duty in field office.
Treasury:
Internal Revenue: Training classes.
Secret Service: On the job and schools.
Customs: Special training at port of New York.
Narcotics: District supervisor.
Coast Guard: Treasury Law Enforcement School.

28. How is their effectiveness as investigators evaluated?

Agriculture: On basis of thoroughness and accuracy, completion of requirements with reasonable promptness.
Air Force: Quality and quantity of review under constant review. Periodic evaluation reports.
Army: Normal efficiency reports; progress report semiannually, evaluating investigators, prepared by supervisor, reviewed by Chief, Counter Intelligence Corps.
Civil Service Commission: Reports of investigators reviewed, and records kept showing quality of work. Additional training given as necessary.
Commerce: Effectiveness evaluated through type of report submitted.
General Services: Supervising officials evaluate on basis of production, accuracy, judgment, and ingenuity.
Justice: FBI, through a system of performance ratings, general and specific ratings of performances.
Navy: Evaluated through qualified supervisory staffs.
Post Office: By review of their work; also through efficiency rating system.
State: Review by agent in charge.
Treasury:
Internal Revenue: Review by agent in charge.
Secret Service: Review by agent in charge.
Customs: Work reports.
Narcotics: Work reports.
Coast Guard: Officer in charge.

29. *Estimate, if possible, the costs of conducting these checks and investigations. Itemize these according to (1) salary; (2) travel and per diem; (3) other.*

Agriculture: No estimates.

Air Force: No estimates.

Army: No estimates.

Civil Service:

Type of case	Salary	Travel per diem	Other	Total
Atomic Energy Commission.....	\$125.60	\$16.40	\$15.00	\$157.00
Other agencies.....	153.51	20.04	18.45	192.00
Record check.....	4.35	None	.44	4.79
Suitability.....	37.86	3.83	2.21	43.90
Veterans' preference.....	74.00	7.49	4.32	85.81
Other merit-system cases.....	72.00	7.29	4.20	83.49
Postmaster candidates.....	51.00	5.16	2.98	59.14
Competitive qualifications.....	155.00	15.69	9.05	179.74

Commerce: No figures, but below CSC standards.

General Services: (1) \$169,538; (2) \$19,945; (3) \$9,973.

Justice: FBI, see question No. 9 for only available information.

Navy: No figures available.

Post Office: No figures available.

State: (1) \$994,605; (2) \$100,098; (3) \$23,109; total, \$1,117,812.

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: (1) \$100; (2) \$25; (3) \$10; total, \$135, (estimate).

Secret Service: (1) \$100; (2) \$15; (3) \$20; total, \$135, (estimate).

Customs: (1) \$73.69; (2) \$6.89; (3) \$7.98; total, \$88.56, (estimate).

Narcotics: (1) \$100; (2) \$45; (3) \$5; total, \$150, (estimate).

Coast Guard: (1) \$26,281.52; (2) \$8,180.98; (3) \$62.41; total, \$34,534.91, (estimate).

30. *Express your ideas and suggestions for improving present administrative investigative practices.*

Agriculture: -----

Air Force: Considered adequate.

Army: Minimum standards of investigation and clearance applicable to other agencies might reduce the number of routine agency checks necessary under current practices.

Civil Service: Agencies should use the information developed by the Commission and only supplement it when necessary.

Commerce: It is believed a better system of exchange of investigative data could possibly be developed which could promote a closer relationship between various agencies.

General Services: None.

Justice: FBI, none.

Navy: Cooperation among agencies.

Post Office: No comments.

State: (a) Free cooperation among agencies; (b) revision of standard form 57, include pertinent information.

18 PERSONNEL INVESTIGATIONS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Treasury:

Internal Revenue: Continuous study.

Secret Service: No comments.

Customs: No comments.

Narcotics: No comments; present methods O. K.

Coast Guard: No comment; present methods adequate.

COMMENTARY ON REPLIES IN QUESTIONNAIRE

No widespread duplication between field and central offices within agencies is apparent. It is true that notice of completed reports from the field may be delayed in reaching the central index, but a measure of delay here appears inevitable. Only one agency fails to maintain a central file.

Some agencies do not make national agency checks prior to initiating a full-scale investigation. By checking the files of the FBI, Army, Navy, and Coast Guard Intelligence, as well as other agencies who have investigation reports, the employing agency quite possibly could save itself considerable duplication of effort.

Agencies do not ordinarily aid each other in conducting investigations, except through cooperative use of previous reports. The State Department is required by law to receive active aid from several agencies.

Generally speaking, cost records of investigations are inadequate. Those cost records furnished are difficult to compare because they often involve different type investigations. However, for a full-scale background investigation, the figures ranged from an estimated \$88.56 in the Bureau of Narcotics to \$192 in the Civil Service Commission.

There is a distinct need for more uniform standards for the various types of security investigations. Some agencies publish standards; some do not. The published standards differ widely as to content. To phrase this point another way, we may say that an agency will clear a person for a sensitive position on the basis of a check which another agency might consider inadequate.

There is wide variance in the job requirements for investigators. Following employment, the type training program for these individuals varies from no program to an interim course of several weeks' duration.

The Department of State, the Postal Inspection Service, the FBI, the Customs Bureau, the Narcotics Bureau, and the United States Secret Service make a full-scale investigation prior to appointment for all employees. This serves as a suitability, loyalty, and security check. The remaining agencies make complete background investigations for selected officials, mostly for security purposes.

There is great disparity in the time required for a background investigation. The time required varied from 13 calendar days as reported by General Services Administration to a maximum of 9 months as reported by the Department of the Army, and 12 months as reported by Commerce. The norm for all agencies is between 60 and 90 days.

Only one agency gave an estimate as to the number of persons who refused employment as a result of delay in the investigative procedures. The Department of State estimated that 28 percent of those investigated fell in this class.

Generally the agencies had inadequate records as to the number of personnel investigations in the past 3 years. One reason for the seeming inadequacy of the records is the fact that personnel investigations, as such, were but a small part of the total investigation program of many agencies, so separate figures were not kept on this type of work. Those figures furnished do indicate an increase in the number of personnel investigations in the past 2 years. No doubt this fact is due in part to increased Federal employment; another factor contributing to the increase is the mounting number of security investigations.

No agency wishes to have a central group responsible for all of its administrative investigations. The most often mentioned point against centralization was that since an agency head is responsible for the security of his agency, he should have a staff to protect that security.

No agency gave any detailed suggestions as to improving their own or the total investigative program in the Federal Government.

HOW THE PRESENT PROGRAM MAY BE IMPROVED

The subcommittee has pointed out the difficulty involved in differentiating between the loyalty, suitability, and security programs. This fact complicates any attempt to uncover duplication as among the various investigative groups.

An analysis of the data submitted above indicates several areas wherein duplication and overlapping may be prevalent. It is realized that the type and sensitivity of the position involved may require checks and investigations of varying degree, insofar as security and suitability are concerned. Nevertheless, there are certain basic data which pertain to all three areas, regardless of the sensitivity of the position.

It is also realized that the agency head is responsible for the employment of suitable personnel in his own agency and therefore must have discretion as to whom he shall or shall not employ. In other words, evaluation or even further inquiry to supplement a previous investigation is eminently proper, whereas a second or third going over of the ground already covered is wasteful of both money and manpower.

A central index known as the master index file is maintained by the Civil Service Commission. Here are recorded reports of investigations and checks conducted by the Commission, as well as by individual agencies, as reported to the Commission by means of Standard Form 79, Notice of Personnel Investigations. Unfortunately, not all agencies submit this form immediately on the start of an investigation, as required by civil-service regulations. One agency, for example, does not forward the report until the investigation is completed, while another agency simply ignores the regulation and submits no report at all. In other cases, several days may elapse before the form is dispatched. These delays and omissions naturally make the master index less current, and may frequently result in 2 or 3 simultaneous investigations by separate agencies, each unaware of the other's activities. This situation could be corrected by strict compliance with civil-service regulations. Any deviations or laxity

should be officially brought to the attention of the head of the offending agency.

A more serious duplication of effort occurs when one agency refuses to accept at face value a previous investigative report made by another agency. Supposedly these prior reports are evaluated and used if the coverage meets the requirements of the interested agency. Two trouble areas emerge from the evaluation process:

1. Most agencies who conduct investigations for security clearances believe that they have some peculiar problem that no other agency understands. Therefore, these agencies hesitate to accept prior investigations for all they are worth.

2. Some agencies believe that the investigative staffs of other agencies are not adequately trained at their work. Therefore, completed reports are not taken at their face value.

The first problem could be alleviated to some extent by agreement among the departments and agencies as to the investigative thoroughness needed for the various degrees of security clearances. Officers in the Civil Service Commission state that many agencies do use the standard set up by the Department of Defense. On the other hand, employees cleared in agencies by other standards are subject to security investigations by those agencies with higher standards.

The second problem could be solved in part if all investigators, having met prescribed employment standards, were given training courses meeting prescribed minimum standards. As things now stand, investigators are trained by their own agencies in a number of ways for their future assignments.

SUMMARY

The foregoing discussions of the information disclosed to the subcommittee leads to one firm conviction, viz: that the existence of the three separate programs of loyalty, suitability, and security is the primary factor which results in confusion, duplication, delay, and waste. Not until these programs are consolidated and standardized will any appreciable improvement or economy result. We therefore urge that this matter be fully explored by the Congress, and that necessary legislation be enacted to effect such consolidation. Such legislation should include provision for designating one agency, presumably the Civil Service Commission, as the responsible agency for coordinating the loyalty, security, and suitability programs, and setting appropriate standards for administration of such programs.

We recommend that Civil Service Commission should be designated as the executive branch agency responsible for coordinating agency programs for investigation of civilian employees and candidates. The Commission should be authorized and directed to establish standards and regulations for this investigation program and for the defining of acceptable agency investigations programs within this framework of standards.

○